

SOUTHCENTRAL ALASKA SUBSISTENCE REGIONAL
ADVISORY COUNCIL PUBLIC MEETING

October 7, 1996
Caribou Cafe
Glennallen, Alaska

VOLUME I

PRESENT:

Mr. Roy S. Ewan, Chair, Chairman
Mr. Gilbert Dementi, Sr.
Mr. Donald Kompkoff, Sr.
Mr. Benjamin E. Romig
Mr. Gary V. Oskolkoff
Mr. Fred John, Jr.
Mr. Ralph Lohse

P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council. This is a public meeting. I want to inform all the guest, the people that haven't been to these meetings that this is public. We're going to have time for the public to talk about whatever you have to comment on any Federal Subsistence Management program later on the agenda. We're going to go through normal business of roll call, adoption of agenda, minutes and so on and then we're going to have election of officers. But, for those of you that haven't been to these meetings this is being recorded. If you're going to say something we want to ask you to come up to the mic, state your name and maybe address and other things for the record, and who you're representing if you're representing anything.

With that I'm going to ask for roll call?

MR. JOHN: Roy S. Ewan?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Here.

MR. JOHN: Gilbert Dementi, Sr.

MR. DEMENTI: Here.

MR. JOHN: Donald Kompkoff, Sr.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Here.

MR. JOHN: Benjamin E. Romig?

MR. ROMIG: Here.

MR. JOHN: Gary Oskolkoff?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Here.

MR. JOHN: Ralph Lohse?

MR. LOHSE: Here.

MR. JOHN: Fred John, Jr. here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you very much. We're going to have an Elder give a vocation if we found one, but I guess the person that was supposed to give the invocation isn't here tonight, so we're going to pass over that unless there is someone here that wants to go and do that.

Okay. I'd like to introduce myself, my Roy Ewan. I live in Gakona, just north of the junction down here about 10 miles. (Indiscernible - recording malfunction)
introduce yourselves.

MR. LOHSE: Ralph Lohse from Cordova.

MR. KOMPKOFF: Don Kompkoff from Cordova.

MR. JOHN: Fred John, Jr. from Mentasta.

MR. ROMIG: Fred Romig from Cooper Landing.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Gary Oskolkoff from Ninilchik.

MR. DEMENTI: Gilbert Dementi from Cantwell.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. In our audience we have one Federal Subsistence Board member and that's Jim Caplan. Welcome to the meeting and welcome to Glennallen, Jim. With that I'd like the agency people starting with Rod, you know, to start introducing yourselves, let's go around.

MR. KUHN: Okay. I'm Rod Kuhn with the Forest Service Subsistence Office in Anchorage.

MR. BOOTH: Tony Booth, I'm with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Refuge Division, Anchorage.

MR. SANDERS: Gary Sanders, Alaska Department of Fish & Game, Juneau, .

MR. WILLIS: Robert Willis, U.S Fish & Wildlife Service

Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage.

MS. MEEHAN: Rosa Meehan, Fish & Wildlife Service, Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage.

MR. GREENWOOD: Bruce Greenwood, National Park Service Subsistence. At this meeting I'll be filling in for Rachel Mason who was unable to attend.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. Let me stop there and introduce our coordinator here, our subsistence coordinator, Helga Eakon.

MS. EAKON: Helga Eakon, the Regional Council Coordinator. And this is our Court Reporter, Annalisa.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. With Hollis.

MR. TWITCHELL: Hollis Twitchell, Denali National Park.

MR. LOGAN: I'm Dan Logan, Forest Service in Cordova, I'll be filling in for Steve Zemke.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess we start with Bob first, back there.

MR. TOBEY: Bob Tobey, Fish & Game Glennallen.

MR. SELLINGER: Jeff Sellinger (Ph), Fish & Game, Glennallen.

MR. GALGINAITIS: Mike Galginaitis, I'm not a Federal employee, but I work for a company that contracts a lot for government agencies and we do subsistence work, among, other things. And I attend these meetings on a fairly basis.

MR. CHASE: I'm Mark Chase, for the Fish & Wildlife Service from the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge.

MR. WELLS: My name is Jay Wells with the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park here in Copper Center and Glennallen.

MR. GALIPEAU: I'm Russ Galipeau, I'm the Resource Management Specialist for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve.

MR. JARVIS: I'm Jon Jarvis, Superintendent for Wrangell-St. Elias National Park and Preserve.

MR. BANE; Ray Bane, National Park Service Anchorage.

MR. GARY LEHNHAUSEN: I'm Gary Lehnhausen, Forest Service. I'm forest planner on the Chugach National Forest.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) from Chitna with the Chitna Native Corporation.

MS. STICKWAN: Gloria Stickwan CRNA.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Anybody else we didn't introduce here? Ron.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: (Indiscernible) Gulkana Village Council.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you introduce yourself?

MS. EDWARDS: Teri Edwards from the Office of Subsistence Management for the Fish & Wildlife Service.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. With that I want to _- you know, I'm not the spokesperson for the Glennallen area but I want to welcome all you visitors up here.

Just for your information most of the communities out here are not organized into a formal government. A lot of the villages operate on what would be called a Traditional Council. The communities within our region are participating here, particularly the Ahtna Region, we have Cantwell over in the Denali Park area and we have Mentasta north of here, Mentasta, Chistochina, Gakona, Gulkana, Copper Center, Tazlina and Chitna, most of these communities are _- most of them are predominantly Native like Glennallen is mostly non-Native and Tazlina mostly non-Native. Like I say, there's no formal government out here which is how people like it. A lot of the people live a subsistence life style.

I would like to open it up for any local person that might want to welcome our guests here. Anybody else from the local area?

If not we'll go on to the adoption of the agenda.

MS. EAKON: Mr. Chair, before we do that we do have an addition under 9J, a new item, and that is the Alaska Department of Fish & Game request for reconsiderations. And if Rosa could kindly help me, the Council members do not have a copy of this because I just received this last Thursday. And so we're going to take this up under new business as 9J.1. And new business is on your agenda on page 3.

MS. MEEHAN: Do you want me to distribute these over here?

MS. EAKON: Yes, please. Those of you with notebooks you also do not have a copy of this document. We do have lots of copies there. And I do have extras here. Okay.

And by way of explanation, the ones you want to be concerned about are R96-04 regarding Region 2 Unit 6 black bear. The State of Alaska Fish & Game Department would like to restore the previous C&T use determination which recognizes C&T in Unit 6(D) only for residents of Chenega Bay and Tatitlek.

And R96-05 Region 2 Unit 15 A and B moose. Fish & Game would like the Board to rescind a C&T determination for residents of Nanwalek, Ninilchik, Port Graham and Seldovia.

And also on your agenda page 2 please note that when the U.S. Forest Services gives their report the presenter would like a few minutes to set up, so may we please have a break to allow for that?

On page 3 of the agenda under 9, new business, F, Bruce Greenwood is also going to cover Proposals 56 and 57. Could you please check your books and see if under 9F, do you have a copy of the proposals in your book? If you do not I do have an envelope here of copies. These proposals deal with Unit 12 caribou and they were tabled by the Federal Subsistence Board at the request of the Southcentral Regional Council. And when you met in Cordova in March you had wanted more information to be presented at this meeting, so Bruce will be prepared to present this information. DO you have a copy of those proposals in your book?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Under 9F?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, that would be 9F. You should have Proposals 56 and 57. In any case, Teri will have them. And under 9H the Copper River Native Association is going to introduce a designated hunter proposal. And we do have copies of that proposal available.

And under 9I, cooperative agreements, right after cooperative agreements Bruce Greenwood will introduce a proposal for a Ninilchik Cooperative Agreement. And because this is very new, could you please pass this out to, first of all, the Regional Council Members so that you could look it over tonight. The Department of Fish & Game would like the Regional Council to approve this cooperative agreement, however, we'll talk about it Wednesday morning. And that's it regarding agenda review, Mr. Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Does everybody have that? I sure didn't get everything but, hopefully, you will remind us as we get to that.

MS. EAKON: Yes. When we get to those items I will remind you of the handouts.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there any other additions to the agenda or deletions?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: If I might. I'm going to have to leave on Tuesday night and I would prefer if there's a way sometime, perhaps, tomorrow we could discuss any proposals that would affect the Kenai Peninsula to, perhaps, take place tomorrow rather than early Wednesday morning.

MS. EAKON: Okay. In which case if you look on page 2 of your agenda _- Ray Bane, are you going to be here for the entire meeting? Are you going to be here Wednesday morning?

MR. BANE; I can stay. I'll be here _- no, I will not be here Wednesday morning. I have to leave.

MS. EAKON: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I propose that we start earlier in the morning and in order to accommodate Gary's request.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You mean tomorrow morning?

MS. EAKON: Yes. And.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well, I'm a working man. I'll try to be here. The new Chair or can take over or whoever will be Chair tomorrow. But I would like to be at the office for about an hour.

MS. EAKON: Okay. Could we start like at 8:30? If we start at 8:30 we could squeeze in the Ninilchik Cooperative Agreement and the State RFR. Okay? And we could do _ - in fact, we could start with those first thing in the morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. You'll remind us which proposal we have?

MS. EAKON: The State _ - the Fish & Game RFRs, the handout that you just got, and also the Ninilchik Cooperative Agreement, we'll start with those two items tomorrow morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is there any objection to what Gary is proposing that some of the Kenai Peninsula proposals be considered tomorrow rather than the third day? There's no objection so we'll go ahead and do that.

Any other additions? If not I'll entertain a motion to adopt the agenda.

MR. LOHSE: So moved.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion. Is there a second?

MR. KOMPKOFF: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is seconded. All in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed by the same sign. Motion carried.

The item is to adopt the minutes, the last meeting minutes of March 4, 5 and 6, they're in your packet.

MR. LOHSE: I make a motion that we adopt the minutes from March 4 through 6, 1996.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a second?

MR. ROMIG: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion and a second to adopt the minutes of March 4 through 6. All in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed by the same sign. The motion is carried.

The next item on our agenda is election of officers and I'll turn it over to Helga.

MS. EAKON: For your information elections are held at the fall meetings of this Regional Council. The office of Chair serves a one year term, however, may serve more than one year. The Chair conducts the Regional Council meetings and attends and represents the Regional Council at meetings of the Board. The Chair is a voting member of the Council and signs reports, correspondence, meeting minutes and other documents for external distribution. With that I will open the floor for nominations for the office of Chair.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: I'd like to nominate Roy Ewan.

MS. EAKON: Gary Oskolkoff has nominated Roy Ewan. Are there any other nominations?

MR. LOHSE: I move that nominations cease.

MR. ROMIG: I second it.

MS. EAKON: It has been moved and second that nominations cease. All in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MS. EAKON: Those opposed same sign. With that Mr. Ewan is your Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. I wasn't asked if I was going to accept or not (Laughter).....

All right. Thank you very much. I appreciate the vote of confidence.

Next officer to elect is the vice-Chair. Who's the present vice-Chair now? Is it Lee Basnar, right?

MS. EAKON: We do not have a present vice-Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: So the election is open for the nomination of vice-Chairman.

MR. ROMIG: I'd like to nominate Ralph Lohse.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ralph Lohse has been nominated. Are there any other nominations?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I move that nominations be closed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a motion.....

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is second. Is there any discussion of the motion, if not all in favor say aye?

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed by same sign? Motion carried. The next office is secretary of the Council. The secretary is Fred John.

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to renominate Fred John.

MR. LOHSE: Second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There's a motion and second. Any other nominations?

MR. LOHSE: I move that nominations cease.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. He made the motion, is there a second?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. The motion is seconded to close the nomination. All in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed by the same sign? The officers then are Chairman, myself, Ralph Lohse vice-Chair and secretary, Fred John.

At this time we're going to open the meeting to public comments. I want to remind you if you will come up to the front and state your name for the record and all that, if you represent any organization please do so because this is all recorded for the benefit of the public. Are there any public comments? Does anyone want to make a comment?

You can make a comment later on any time, just sign up. The process is you sign up, over there is a sign-up sheet, and Helga or someone will send a note up to me and we'll allow you some time. Any time during these meetings especially in the rural areas like there where it's hard to not only get to the meeting, but find the meeting place and all that, so we will allow you to make public comment any subsistence management issue.

If there are no public comment _- oh,.....

MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chairman, is there's no public comment I'd like to bring something else up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Lohse.

MR. LOHSE: We went through the minutes real fast and I had one word I wanted to clarify and we didn't get around to clarifying it. On page 6 where it talks about Unit 6 deer season. We have Federal land is uphill. There it basically should have been Federal land is above high tide mark because uphill is a pretty indefinite word.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want to correct it?

MR. LOHSE: I was planning on putting that in for correction. It's just a clarification. It really doesn't change the meanings.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't think it does. Is there any objection to that correction to the minutes?

MR. LOHSE: But that word uphill should be above high tide mark.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hearing no objection we'll go ahead and have that corrected.

MS. EAKON: Yes. And that correction will be done to the minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll go on into reports then. The first report will be on the Federal Subsistence Board meeting of April 30th through May 3, 1996.

MS. EAKON: Yes. I could kind of introduce this. The Federal Subsistence Board deliberated on the recommendations on this Regional Council on May 3rd. And because none of the officers could attend the Board meeting on that particular day, Ben Romig at very short notice kindly consented to represent this Council and present the Regional Council recommendations. And I might add that he did a very, very nice job and we appreciate that.

If you look in your books under Tab 8A1 you will find a copy of the Federal Subsistence Board's letter which distills (ph) what they did with each of your recommendations on the proposals. But before we do that I want to ask Ben if he had anything to add regarding the Board meeting on May 3rd.

MR. ROMIG: No.

MS. EAKON: Okay. Rather than take time to go over each and every proposal unless you have questions. Just keep in mind that we are going to talk about the tabled, there were only two tabled proposals, Proposals 56 and 57.

And that's all I have, Mr. Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. What about the July 16 meeting?

MS. EAKON: Okay. The Federal Subsistence Board met on July 16 to consider the request for reconsideration submitted by the Kenai Peninsula Outdoor Coalition. And the Board action reversed its May 1996 decision and granted a positive customary and traditional determination for moose in Unit 15 for the four communities of Ninilchik, Nanwalek, Port Graham and Seldovia. The Board also established an August 18 to September 20 subsistence moose season on Federal public lands within the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge in Unit 15 excluding the Skilak Loop Management Area, which remains closed to all moose hunting. And the residents of Ninilchik, Nanwalek, Port Graham and Seldovia were allowed to harvest one moose with the antler restrictions.

I not heard how _- what the harvest report was on that particular hunt. Have you, Gary?

MR. OSKOLKOFF: No, I haven't.

MS. EAKON: Okay. But I'm sure we'll have a report by the winter meeting.

And Gary Oskolkoff and Ben Romig traveled to Anchorage to the Board meeting and provided comments to the Board.

The Board also acted on Special Action 96-1 which had been

submitted by the Bureau of Land Management. And this modified the hunting season for Nelchina caribou in Unit 13 for this current regulatory year in response to recently extended state seasons. And our staff conferred with Herb Smelser (Ph) who is the director of Natural Resources of Copper River Native Association and also with the then vice-Chair, Lee Basnar, and they both were very supportive of this special action. And the State also supported it and the Federal Subsistence Board unanimously passed this. You were sent a letter with a copy of the special action on July 17. And you do have the letter in your book as 8A2.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is that it? Is that it?

MS. EAKON: Uh-huh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you very much. I also want to add my thanks to Ben and Gary and Lee Basnar who's not here today. He resigned from the Board and has been replaced by Gilbert Dementi who filled in for me when I was not available to at the Federal Subsistence Board meeting. I appreciate that. Thank you.

MS. EAKON: I might add that our staff did send Lee Basnar a real beautiful certificate of appreciation framed, it looks really nice. They also sent a certificate to Robert Heinrichs.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Then we'll go onto the next item and that's U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service Federal Subsistence Management Program. Rosa.

MS. MEEHAN: My name is Rosa Meehan and I'm with the Office of Subsistence Management in Anchorage. And I'm somewhat new to the program and I'm anxious to meet all of you and learn how this Council works.

The one item that I wanted to mention has to do with the RFRs that we passed out to you. And there's three of them that pertain to this region. We did just receive those in the office and as of now there's no time scheduled with the Federal Board to look at those yet. We will be starting the staff analyses on these in the near future. And we've been very interested in hearing any comments that you as a Council have to make on those RFRs and any

motions that you'd like to make and then we could pass onto the board. And of course, Roy, be involved in the Board meeting when they discuss those probably in mid-November, but that has not been scheduled.

And I'd like to pass the microphone to Robert Willis who's got a few other topics to share with you.

MR. WILLIS: I have three items, Mr. Chair, two of which involve some new regulations that were put in place last year and so we have a year's data on them. I thought the Council would be interested in hearing the reports.

First of all, the designated hunter regulation was in effect last year for the first time. We had that in place in two areas; in Southeast Alaska, Units 1 through 4 for deer, Unit 5 for moose, and on Kodiak Island which is Unit 8 we also had a designated hunter regulation for deer.

On Kodiak Island we had 58 persons request designated hunter permits for deer. We've had rather disappointing reporting from those people, 27 of them or about 47 percent have submitted hunt reports to us so far. We need to do some follow-up and try to get those people to send in their hunt reports. Of those hunters who reported harvesting deer, they took a total of 109 deer and was split almost exactly between those taken for themselves and those taken for other people. And this is one of the key items of information we were looking for. Most people took two deer for themselves and two deer for other people that they were hunting for.

Based on the reports received to date we estimate 234 deer harvested by the designated hunters and 112 of those for other people.

In Southeast Alaska in Units 1 through 4 we had some problems getting the overlays or the part of the permit that the agency keeps sent back to us. The Forest Service was passing out permits down there and also some local vendors and apparently didn't get the word that these were supposed to be sent back to us as soon as they were filled out by a designated hunter. And so we don't have an estimate of harvest down there. We do have

a summer report on the number of people who picked up those permits and that was 149 people. And hopefully, we'll have better results next year. We're already working on straightening out that reporting problem and in deference to the Forest Service they do have a lot of other things to do and we apparently didn't get the word across that these permits needed to be sent back to us right away so we're running behind on those reports.

The other new regulation we have is actually for this year was the moose hunt in Unit 15. And I did call Chuck Miller our computer specialist this morning to get the latest that we had on that hunt. And the information he gives me is that 57 hunts picked up permits. We've had 38 report so far that they hunted or 38 reports. I'm not sure if all those people hunted or just those turned in reports. I can't give you that yet. And three moose killed.

Now, right after the season closed I checked on it and at that time we had four moose killed. That was the report. Then our computer crashed about a week ago and apparently it brought one moose back to life when it did so because now we have a report of three killed. So I'll get that straightened out and let you know more accurately the next time we get together. Two we know were taken in Subunit 15(C) and one in Subunit 15(B). And that's all I have right now on the moose report.

I do have some homework for you. You'll recall last fall we told you that the biologists were putting together a Wildlife Management Handbook for all of existing Council members and new Council members as they come on board. What you're being given there is a very rough first draft of that. We lost a month, obviously, with the government shut down and we've had some people on over-load this summer and we're running behind where we thought we would be.

What we would like for you to do is look at this first cut. These are some sample chapters and let us know what you think about the technical level, the length, the type of information that's being presented. Give us some feedback on whether you think this what the Council members will need to help them do the job.

It's turned out to be an extremely difficult undertaking

because we have such a wide range of experience on this Council. Some of you have been working on advisory councils for years, you've worked with Fish & Game, you've worked with the Federal programs, your level of knowledge is quite high on wildlife management issues. On the other hand, we have other people especially in the northern part of the state to whom English is a second language. And so it's very difficult trying to find a level to write a semi-technical handbook that everybody or almost everyone will find useful. So what I'd like for you to do ideally is to look this over while we're here this week and give them back to me when we break on Wednesday morning. If you'd like to have more time, you can't do that, you have an addressed postage paid envelope there that you can look them over, write your comments on them, there's some questions that we put on there that we'd like you to give us some input on, and drop it in the mail and get it back to me.

What we hope to do is when we get some comments back and adjust the writing according to the comments we get, is to do a really nice booklet with blocked columns and some illustrations, more than just the text that you have there. Put it in a hard cover of some kind and also update it. We've got about four or five species there, we'll try to add a species or two each year as we have the time to do it. And we hope that these handbooks will evolve as we get more feedback from Council members as to what they really need in the way of information and we can improve the product as we go along.

I believe that's all I have at this time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you, Robert and Rosa. You're done here? Okay. The next report will be from U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Kenai National Wildlife Refuge.

MR. CHASE: Hello. My name is Mark Chase, I'm the deputy refuge manager at the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge. Real quick, what was the date of the last Regional Council meeting? I don't know how far back to go.

MS. EAKON: March, early March of this year.

MR. CHASE: Okay. That's fine. Since that time on the Refuge a few things of interest that have been going on. Last

summer we had a very active wildfire season on the Kenai Peninsula. Early in May we had a large fire just north of Skilak Lake that burned 5,200 acres for about a week, May 10th through the 17th. And we ended up bringing in an overhead team. There's a lot of personnel involved with that, a lot of suppression efforts there directed at protecting some campground facilities. And it ended up burning very actively for about two days and then the fire fighters were able to confine that between the lake and a few roads.

In the future, I think, you know, it's hopeful that that will create some good moose habitat and other wildlife habitat in there and we'll just have to see how that reacts.

Later in, I believe it was June, there was a 17,000 acre fire south of Tustumena Lake that burned about 12,000 acres on the Refuge and about 5,000 acres on other lands. And again, we're hopeful that that will provide some good moose browse and good moose habitat, help out the moose in the local area.

Other things that are happening in the Refuge that the Council would probably be interested in, the Refuge right now is writing what's called a Public Use Management Plan. And it's a review basically of all public use activities on the Refuge, ranging from camping, hiking, trail facilities, campground facilities, boating, just a whole myriad of public use activities. We hope to have a draft of that out by the end of the year. And we would certainly bring that to the Council for comments on alternatives that are being discussed in there. That's s full National Environmental Policy Act process of scoping meetings with the public and there will be a range of alternatives. The Fish & Wildlife Service will select preferred alternatives, put a draft out to the public and, hopefully, finalize a plan sometime next summer. And that addresses the whole gambit of public recreation activities on the Refuge. That's a big project that we're involved in now.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mark, may I ask where is that going? I mean are you going to get funding, is it something that needs funding or.....

MR. CHASE: The immediate need is if there's changes that need to be made and there are regulatory changes we would have to get a regulation package passed to implement regulations. And

then if those require additional funding in order for us to do that then we would request additional funding or personnel or what is required to implement that plan.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was thinking more like if you had to build facilities to accommodate whatever.....

MR. CHASE: Right. Those packages are typically, we package construction projects in the budget process and they may or may not be funded for year to year, but we identify them as needs. And sometimes they can hang around for years and when funding becomes available then we do the projects.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. CHASE: Does anybody else have any questions about anything that's happening. If not that's about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much. Yes?

MR. ROMIG: Didn't you have a control burn on Mystery Creek?

MR. CHASE: We did. We attempted to ignite a prescribed burn out on Mystery Creek Road. That's in Unit 15(A). It's an area that was burned in 1947 by a large wildfire and the conditions being what they were with the fire situation around the rest of the country we were worked into a very narrow window of when we could accomplish that when we had available personnel. The day we attempted to ignite it the humidities were too high, it burned very poorly and smoldered around for several weeks before it was rained out. Probably burned 100 acres of so.

The plan out there is to burn 5,200 acres over the next few years with two primary objectives. One is to reduce the fuel levels that if we get a large wildfire out on some part of the Refuge, if you have fuel breaks, different age forests between the burn and the communities there's much less danger of a fire -- much easier to control a fire and avoid the fire getting into the areas where the people live. And then a secondary objective, of course, is to improve wildlife habitat and, hopefully, stimulate some hardwood, birch and aspen regeneration and get some of the moose

browse out there.

Anything else?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: I had a question. Do you feel like the use on the Refuge is up this year or down?

MR. CHASE: Overall use, the general trend since 1989 has been pretty steady entries. Most of the use on the Refuge is fishing days with the Kenai River, Russian River confluence, that's the majority of the public use. Moose hunting, public and things is probably pretty stable. On the Refuge over the past few years there's kind of been a shift of moose hunting from 15(A) to 15(C). And that trend has generally continued because the 1947 and 1969 burns that created such favorable conditions in 15(A) are now reaching a point where they're not producing moose like they used to. Some of the browse has grown out of reach, and so we have seen a slight decrease in probably hunters in 15(A). But overall the total use is probably roughly the same or up slightly.

Anything else. All right. Well, thank you. I'll be around all week if you have questions on anything else.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you. Who can address B then, was that addressed already?

MR. CHASE: What's that?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The records upland game hunting.

MR. CHASE: Tony is going to.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: You've got somebody else. Oh, okay. Lead poisoning of waterfowl within the Refuge.

MR. BOOTH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Tony Booth, I'm with the Fish & Wildlife Service Division of Refuge in the Regional Office in Anchorage. And what I wanted to do is let you know basically what the Refuge is doing here with some still shot regulations and ask, perhaps, for some feedback from you guys.

As you well know, we documented for a long time that there's been a significant level on a nationwide wide level of lead poisoning waterfowl and that's what led us to eventually implement regulations beginning in the last 1980s and finally finalized them in 1991. We phased in regulations that provided the use of lead shot for waterfowl. And that was because of well documented lead poisoning problems. We were finding that before we began to implement that as many _- perhaps as many as three million waterfowl a year and it's hard to document the exact numbers because of the problems with lead poisoning.

And so right now, nationwide we're already required to use non-toxic shot, mostly still shot, though at this time there has recently been another alternative been approved. It's very expensive right now, but it's been approved. When we say non-toxic shot and either right now either still or (indiscernible).

And now in the Lower 48 or a nation-wide level the Fish & Wildlife Service is looking for areas where hunting for upland game species in waterfowl areas is still continuing to deposit lead shot in wetlands because there's no requirement to use still shot for upland game. In some of the Lower 48 refuges they've already gone completely to still shot requirements and this is areas that are really intensively hunted, really intensively used. And we've been asked nationwide on the refuges, including Alaska, to look at each or all our refuges and look and see if there are other areas where we need to be implementing still shot requirements for all game, you know, upland game as well as waterfowl species. And right now the only areas we know we're looking at here in Alaska is we know we have documented lead that spectacle eiders out in the Yukon Kuskokwim Delta are picking up some lead, however, we also know that it's not picking it up from upland game hunting. That's still _- there's still continued use of lead shot for waterfowl out there and it's caused that. That's not upland game.

And we are looking at also at Izembek of the level of hunting out there. We're going to look at it some more, but right now we don't have any serious intentions right now of trying to implement any still shot recrements for upland game here. But we've been asked, nonetheless, to use the best available information and we were looking at going to the Regional Council

and the local advisory committees to ask, you know, if there's other refuge areas which you may be concerned about you may be aware of where they may be some potential for concern for use of lead shot.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: Tony, in our area, Southcentral, the only refuge that we have to concern ourself really is the Kenai Refuge, isn't it?

MR. BOOTH: Yes, In essence, yes.

MR. LOHSE: And basically we have rabbits and grouse there and ptarmigan.

MR. BOOTH: Right.

MR. LOHSE: It's pretty much all isolated away from the waterfowl in general, most of those have a habitat that's different than the waterfowl inhabit, don't they?

MR. BOOTH: Well, for the most part. I'm sure there's still ample game hunting down in some wetland areas. It's a matter of the level of that type of activity. It's.....

MR. LOHSE: I mean it's not _-.....

MR. BOOTH:probably not significant.

MR. LOHSE:it's not like pheasant hunting on some of the swamps in the Lower 48.

MR. BOOTH: Right. This concern is mostly a Lower 48 situation where we have intensive use and, nonetheless, we're still going to come and ask your opinion on it anyway, but we don't anticipate a problem in the Kenai.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What you're saying is that there's still a need for educating the public about the use, the shouldn't be using lead, is that correct, is that what I'm hearing?

MR. BOOTH: Well, basically yeah. We still have an ongoing outreach program and it's not much of a problem here, but

there's still other areas of the state where they use lead shot for waterfowl hunting. It's illegal.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Right. I was just wondering. You know, I'm not a duck hunter but I'm starving and that's all I can shoot, that's probably when I'll do that. But _- I don't think Natives in this area are that much of a duck hunter either. They go more for the big game, but in the fall and years ago when there was no law, in spring they used to duck hunt a lot. But I'm just thinking when that change in this law by the use of this lead pellets, how did it go, did they just say you stop using it and throw your old shells away?

MR. BOOTH: In essence, yes. We phased into it by geographic areas in priority of how big a problem it was. Alaska was one of the last areas we phased in in 1991, but yes, as of a certain date it was illegal to use still shot, but before we actually implemented those rules, I mean, went through a lot of public review to make sure that the public knew we were phasing into it and everything.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm not defending anybody, but I know it's a hardship on somebody if they have a lot of lead shells to just dump them and go to the other requirement.

MR. BOOTH: Well, right now _- I mean it's not illegal to use lead for other animals, other things other than waterfowl. The big intention is to get lead out of the water _- the wetland areas because it is a toxicant, it is a pollutant and it does, you know, affect(ph).....

MR. CHAIRMAN: What I'm saying is I think I understand what's going on over there, the Yukon area or wherever you have problems. Those guys wouldn't use their shells up. I mean they paid for it and.....

MR. BOOTH: The problem is lead is still available on the market and it's still cheaper than still shot. I think that the alternative answer is to get lead off the market, you know, but it's not illegal to manufacturer it and if it's available some people _- we're still working with the people. And I think gradually the use _- the trend or use is going towards steel. And

we've been experimenting with other options other than steel, too. I mean bismuth is another substance that's just recently been approved. It's got more the similar properties of lead. The problem is it's extremely expensive right now. It'll be awhile before it could ever be a marketable solution, I mean it has to be manufactured in a large scale to ever make it economically feasible.

Yes?

MR. LOHSE: Tony, have they found any problem with lead shot in any other birds other than waterfowl? Has there been much documented problem with upland game birds picking up lead shot?

MR. BOOTH: Well, one of the reasons lead shot was banned. I just mentioned waterfowl, but they were also finding _- I can't remember the exact number it seems like it was between _-well, from 1960 to about 1990 they documented as many as 120 bald eagles so apparently, you know, there were other birds being affected. I don't know about other upland game. I mean that's not even upland game. Eagles were picking it up from probably.....

MR. LOHSE: From eating ducks.

MR. BOOTH:scavenging, yeah, waterfowl, cripples or dead waterfowl. So it was getting out there. I don't know about others particularly. The most emphasis was on waterfowl and then when bald eagles got involved and it put a little bit more impetus on it to go that way.

I'm done unless you guys have some more questions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Any other questions?

MR. LOHSE: Just one. So basically what you're doing is you have no proposals in to ban lead shot in the Kenai.

MR. BOOTH: We're asking you if we've overlooked anything. We don't have any proposal for the Kenai.

MR. LOHSE: Yeah. I personally from just knowing what I know about rabbit hunting and grouse hunting I would doubt if very much lead shot would get into the waterfowl environment from

hunting grouse and rabbits.

MR. BOOTH: Well, that's what we figure, too. But we're going to ask anyway (ph).....

MR. LOHSE: You know, if we were hunting pheasants over a swamp it'd be a different story.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Thank you very much.

MR. BOOTH: Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Next item is the Denali Park Service _- or National Park Service, Denali National Park. Hollis Twitchell.

MR. TWITCHELL: Good evening, I'm Hollis Twitchell with Denali National Park. I have three items I'd like to bring before you tonight. The first one deals with the Southcentral Regional Advisory Council's appointment of a member to Denali Subsistence Resource Commission. The Southcentral has two appointing positions to Denali's Commission. Lee Basnar was seated in one of those positions and he, of course, has resigned the Commission as well as his seat on the council. So that seat is currently vacant. And we would like to bring a name, a nomination before you for consideration for being appointed in that position.

Lee was very effective, I believe, between the Council and the Commission. Being seated on both of those advisory bodies he was able to bring directly to you the thoughts and concerns of the Commission itself. And in that light, I think that was a very positive thing.

I would like on behalf of Denali to recommend to you that you would consider Gilbert Dementi as possible candidate for appointment to the Commission. The requirements for an appointee to the Commission from the Council level is that the individual has to be a subsistence user of the Park area. And certainly Gilbert being a resident for 20 years in the Cantwell area well represents the Cantwell area and the subsistence uses in that region.

The second requirement that the individual needs to sit

either on an advisory council such as this as or a state Fish & Game advisory committee. So those are the two requirements for a nominee for the Commission.

And, again, with Gilbert's position on this Council he would be an eligible candidate for consideration.

We've had no one come forth from the communities that could meet those two critieras, so I don't have any other name to offer for you to consider tonight. Gilbert had expressed some.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Can I ask about that? You have two seats from the Regional Council? One from, what is it, Eastern and one from Southcentral?

MR. TWITCHELL: One from the Eastern Interior and two from Southcentral.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, okay.

MR. TWITCHELL: And the reason that that ratio was broken out that way is that Cantwell being one of the larger communities to Cantwell with about 147 people, I think at the last census, was one of the largest user areas. And so they requested that two appointees be allocated to Southcentral and then one to Eastern which is primarily the northern side of the Alaska Range. And currently your other appointment, Vern Carlson, still is sitting on Denali's Commission. And so on behalf of Gilbert, if he's still interested, I'd like to recommend him for consideration.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Helga, on process do we just _- can we take it right now?

MS. EAKON: Yes. Through a motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Is there a motion _- do we hear a motion on this recommendation?

MR. JOHN: I'd like to make the motion.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You make the motion?

MR. JOHN: Yeah. Gilbert.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is there a second?

MR. LOHSE: second.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The motion is seconded that we _- we just make a recommendation, right, or do we appoint?

MR. TWITCHELL: You make the appointment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We appoint Gilbert Dementi to the _- what do you call it? Denali.....

MR. TWITCHELL: Subsistence Resource Commission.

MR. CHAIRMAN:Subsistence Resource Commission. Okay. Is there further discussion on the motion? If not all in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed by the same sign? Motion is carried.

MR. TWITCHELL: The second item, I'd like to provide to you a copy of Denali Subsistence Resource Commission's comments on the Park Service's draft review of subsistence law and then the regulations which was introduced to you at your last council meeting. Denali's Commission met just recently and has formulated their comments in regard to that paper. So I won't go into detail for you tonight considering the time, but their comments, I think, are adequately expressed within that paper.

This paper is also being presented to the Western Interior Regional Advisory Council. They had requested specifically that the Commission's comment be provided to them before they in turn submit their comments to the Field Director of the Park Service. So their comments are being presented probably tonight since they're meeting at the same time in Stevens Village.

The third and final item I'd like to carry back to you the gratitude of the residents of the McKinley Village area who were re-entitled to subsistence hunt moose and caribou through a

proposal that this Council put forward to the Board at the last meeting. And they are very much in appreciation of your proposal and the Board's action, and I just bring back to you their gratitude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does anybody have any comments or questions of Mr. Twitchell?

On your letter to Mr. Barbee, can you tell us what we're dealing with? You gave us a copy here....

MR. TWITCHELL: Oh, yes. If you look at Item C of the National Park Service you'll see listed on page 2 of your agenda that there is a section on the draft review of subsistence law and National Park Service regulations. It's a review of what the Park Service is undertaking in looking at our law and our policies and how we manage subsistence within the Park areas within Alaska. And that particular comment paper is out to the public as well as to the Advisory groups around the state to give us input and reflection on how we're managing subsistence on park lands. We'll be talking about that in just a few minutes and if you would like we can go into a little more detail at that time. The paper you have from Denali's RSC is their response and their comments in regards to this draft review.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We'll wait till we get to it. That's fine. I just didn't know what we're supposed to do with it, but we can go on. For our information and make comment if we want to make comment.

MR. TWITCHELL: It's solely to provide you some information on how the Commission responded to that review paper, so you have an idea of what concerns they've expressed in response.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Is that it?

MR. TWITCHELL: That's it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. The next agency is the Forest Service.

MS. EAKON: Wrangell-St. Elias.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'm skipping over one part.

MR. WELLS: You forgot me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Wrangell-St. Elias National Park Preserve. I just nearly skipped over you. I guess you want to talk about council appointment and all that?

MR. WELLS: Yes. My name is Jay Wells, Chief Ranger at Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. And I have five items to bring to you tonight. The first one is similar to Denali. It's time to make an appointment from the Southcentral Regional Council. Unlike Denali we're represented by three regional councils, this one, Southcentral, Southeast and Eastern Interior. Each one of those Councils has an appointment to our Subsistence Resource Commission. And the one appointment that's up actually the end of this month is Freddie John. And so we're asking you to take some action to either re-appoint Fred or somebody else that you feel is appropriate. And again, that person needs to be engaged in subsistence uses within Wrangell-St. Elias National Park. And I can tell you for a fact that Fred certainly is. And so if you want to take some action on that and re-appoint Fred or appoint a new member that would be great.

MS. EAKON: In that regard, Mr. Chair, I do have a letter from Copper River Native Association signed by Ken Johns, the Executive Director, recommending that this Regional Council re-appoint Fred John, Jr. to the Wrangell-St. Elias Park & Preserve Subsistence Resource Commission. And here are copies for your books.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess while we're at this stage here I'll entertain a motion to that effect if that is the desire of Council.

MR. KOMPKOFF: I'll move the motion.

MR. LOHSE: I'll second it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Don Kompkoff made the motion and Ralph Lohse seconded. Any further discussion on the motion?

If not all in favor say aye.

IN UNISON: Aye.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Opposed by same sign. Motion is carried.
Thank you.

MR. WELLS: The next item, the Council's been involved in a number of items relates to the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Resource Commission. I wanted to get back with you on a few of those . You remember last spring the Mentasta caribou hunting in Unit 11 and your recommendation went forward to the Federal Subsistence Board and they did approve a limited hunt, an 804 hunt very similar to the recommendation that the Council here made. And I just want to tell you that we issued actually 14 of the 15 permits, the last permittee is still out of town, we haven't issued that yet, but intend to do that fairly quickly. But those permits went to Elders and people from _- Ahtna people from seven traditional Ahtna villages. And as of last week I only know of one caribou that's been harvested so far, but remember that season goes to the end of March and the caribou are just beginning to move now so, hopefully, we'll have 15 caribou harvested by March.

Also the Unit 13 registration permit hunt for caribou in that small portion of Unit 13 within the Park Preserve boundaries on Federal public land we've been permitting for _- so far only 14 permits have been issued.

One of the other items that i wanted to bring up and get back you on is a recommendation that the SRC passed before you about two years ago for consultation. It concerned the addition of two communities in the Upper Tanana Region, Dot Lake _- or Tetlin and Northway, to add those to the resident zone for Wrangell-St. Elias. And that hunting plan recommendation went through and we've been in the process of drafting a proposed rule to add not only Tetlin and Northway but also Dot Lake, the community of Dot Lake. And we'll be bringing that draft rule making to the Subsistence Resource Commission meeting which should be held in early December this year for their approval and, hopefully, that will be published as a proposed rule.

Let's see, the only other thing, small item actually is we did work with Mentasta Village and were able to get through the

Federal Board, Subsistence Board, they approved a ceremonial moose hunt that was moose that was taken this summer during the cultural camp at Batzulnetas and Fred, you were involved in that one. And that seemed to go pretty well.

And the last thing I want to say unless you have any questions for me is we have been in some very informal discussions with some folks from Mentasta Village concerning the development of a Federal Subsistence reg for a subsistence fishery at Tanada Creek. That'd be the Batulnetas area. And these discussions have only been informal and we've been talking with some of the people in that area, including you, Fred. So that's all I have. I know you're busy so if you have any questions I'd be glad and try to answer them.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any comments or questions for Mr. Wells?

I guess there are no questions. Thank you, Jay.

MR. WELLS: Okay. Thanks. I think the next item, Hollis. I'll just stay here with Hollis.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Now we get to the draft review of the Subsistence on the National Park Service that we were talking about earlier.

MR. TWITCHELL: Hollis Twitchell again from Denali. At your last winter Regional Advisory Council meeting you were presented a copy of the draft paper and we're asked to comment on it. And at that time the Park Service was asking for comments by the end of May. That didn't give enough time for subsistence resource commissions and advisory councils to get it onto their agenda, review it and submit their comments in time to submit it. So the Park Service has extended the period and would like to get comments back by the end of January in 1997. Those comments could be sent right to Bob Barbee, the Field Director for the Park Service.

This was specifically done so that subsistence resource commissions would have time to meet, submit their comments to the director as well as to the regional advisory councils and that way you would have some idea of what the commissions who were sort of

first line advisory groups of parks were thinking, what their concerns were. So that was the reason for extending the requesting comment period.

I don't know whether it would be appropriate to go into the paper at this time or maybe do that at a later time. It does take awhile to go through the paper, Denali's SRC spent four hours on it just to generate the comments that you had there, so it's probably not appropriate to go into it at this time. Maybe if you have time at the end of the meeting, I would be happy to do that if you had those types of questions.

Again, the purpose of the paper was to try to gain some better insight into the intent of Congress and the actual law itself as it applies to national park areas. And so we reviewed those regulations from that standpoint. It was also hoped to bring old and new park managers together as an opportunity train and educate ourselves as to the subsistence management in the park areas. And also to provide a mechanism to initiate any actions to resolve problems that are out there, either a changing of a regulation or a changing of a policy or program, so those were the three focuses and the purposes of the paper. We don't see this as being very finite in time that this review goes on. Some of the issues are fairly complex and they're going to take an ongoing process advisement from the different advisory groups to deal with them. Good examples would be access and eligibility, are not easy issues to deal with. And so some of those are going to be evolving as we go on for a number of years and we fully intend to stay engaged with the advisory groups to try to ensure that we're meeting the needs and the intents. So at this point I guess we'll just look to you for advisement on whether you want to take this up at a later time or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does anyone have any questions or comments? Gilbert is here from that area. Do you have anything that's important? Myself I have not had time to really look at this, you know, the proposal, of course we _- I would like to know if you know any important thing that you're recommending here that we should know about. That would be of help to me.

MR. WELLS: Well, it might be helpful to think about

Hollis' comment early about letting it go through the Subsistence Resource Commission and our commission which will meet in December will spend quite a bit of time on this. And you'll at least get a chance to go through another Regional Advisory Council cycle, so even though the stated January, whatever, 31st, the Regional Council meeting is a little later, there will still be plenty of time to funnel those comments from the Subsistence Resource Commission into your group, both from Denali's which you have before you, and then Wrangell's Commission in December, so I think those comments _- you made need a little time and we can meet tomorrow or whenever, if necessary, to.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I guess what I'm just asking you if you can highlight the important things and, you know, as the council saw it and if not,.....

MR. TWITCHELL: Okay . You have three park commissions associated with Southcentral, Lake Clark National Park, Denali and Wrangell, so if you wait until you receive the pool of comments from those three advisory commissions you'll have a pretty good focus, I think, as to where the problems are.

MR. WELLS: What we could do for you, Roy, and everybody is we could highlight those tonight or tomorrow morning, those things, and give you an idea of what items were particularly controversial or not or confusing or whatever, and you might want to key in on those in the next couple of days. And we'll be around if you want to talk about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Helga?

MS. EAKON: Yes. Mr. Chairman, the window for the winter meeting starts January 27 and ends February 28th. I was thinking, is there magic date to the closing date of your comments?

Mr. WELLS: No. That'll be extended to include that last cycle of meetings.

MS. EAKON: Oh, that'll be very helpful because by then you will know the recommendations of the three subsistence regional commissions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: At our _- like the Wrangell-St. Elias Subsistence Regional Commission, will we get the other proposals too.....

MR. WELLS: Yes, you'll get all of them in December, the Denali's one. And Lake Clark hasn't met on it, but they might by December perhaps.

MR. TWITCHELL: Yeah, I expect that they will certainly before this January 31st.

MR. WELLS: We also have the comments from the State and some of the other groups have commented on it.

MR. LOHSE: Mr. Chair, maybe what they could do is prior to our winter meeting make up a packet with the whole thing as one packet and then us put it on the agenda for the winter meeting.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Summarize it.....

MR. LOHSE: Well, they can include all of the comments and the comments from everybody else and the proposed ruling, make it into one packet that we can have all at one time. And then include it as part of the agenda on our winter meeting because it's something that does need to be taken care of. There are some pretty important items on here.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: I don't know how to coordinate from so many different part,s but that can be done, right?

MR. WELLS: Oh, yeah. The comments just now are starting to come in and we've got _- both Hollis and I have a file with all the comments to date, but by the time your next meeting _- or before your next meeting comes up we should have pretty much all of them, we can put to you in one package, highlighting those issues that cause most concern.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That would be good. Okay. Any other comments or questions? Thank you.

MR. WELLS: Thanks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Now we go to the Forest Service. We'll have Chugach National Forest. We have Steve Zemke on here, but I guess.....

MR. LOGAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm not Steve Zemke, as you can tell, but I'm Dan Logan from our Cordova Office of the Forest Service. And Steve sends his apologies for not being able to make tonight. I'm just filling in for him tonight.

I'd like to direct your attention to Tab 8A6 in your booklet if we could. That's our schedule of proposed actions. It's a quarterly report that comes out by the Chugach National Forest. It gives a very brief summary of all the different actions that are going in the national forests that will require some type of environmental assessment. And you'll see in there that ranges from anything from hiking trails to areas where there's a proposed timber harvest. And there's a brief description of the project with the contact person and the phone number there on each one. And any of those projects we would welcome the Council's comments or concerns on any one of those.

The one that I think is the most important in there that you'll see is the amendment of the Chugach Forest plan. This is an amendment that comes up every 10 years. It sets direction on how we're going to manage the forest over the next 10 year period. And Gary Lehnhausen from our Planning staff is here to talk about that.

MR. LEHNHAUSEN: Yeah. It'll just take a minute to set up the screen. And I've only got about five slides that it'll help me present.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah. Can we take a couple of minute break while you're setting up? Okay.

MR. LEHNHAUSEN: That'd be great.

(Off record)

(On record)

MR. CHAIRMAN: I'll call the meeting back to order.

The Forest Service is doing a presentation here. I'll turn it over to one of you here.

MR. LEHNHAUSEN: Dan Logan already introduced me but I'll introduce myself again. My name is Gary Lehnhausen. I work for the U.S. Forest Service and I'm the Forest Planning team leader on the Chugach National Forest. And I'm here today to give a status report on our forest plan revision effort and a projection of maybe explain the process a little bit and how it might relate to subsistence resource concerns and help you understand the process a little better so that you can get involved and make your involvement more meaningful.

Dan said that it was an amendment, which that's not quite right. An amendment is generally smaller change to a forest plan that we're going through now. We're in the process of revising the forest plan. The options open to us could be to not change anything, but it could also be to change everything in the plan.

The National Forest Management Act of 1976 is the Act that required that all national forests write management plans that are much like city zoning ordinances that identify pieces of land and specify management direction that will take precedent over others, sort of an allocation. And the way it's done on national forest land is that we identify uses that may have emphasis but are not necessarily the only use. And so the original forest plans were written under a multiple use sort of philosophy. The Act also said that every 10 to 15 years we're required to take another look at forest management direction to see if things have changed or people's values have changed within the last 10 years and see if those changes would indicate that we need to change or management direction.

The original Chugach National Forest Plan was completed in 1984 and it was the sixth national forest plan completed out of 156 forests. And the Forest Service has learned a lot from the planning process in the last 12 years. Some of the forests in California just finished their first planning go around a year or two ago because of all the controversy that's come up. And most of the plans that were completed were appealed for different reasons and the Chugach plan is no exception. It was appealed

after the record of decision was signed. And one of the major appeal points was the fact that people felt like the data base _- the amount of data upon which the decisions in the forest plan were based was not adequate and as a settlement to that appeal the Forest Service agreed to complete additional analysis and put together a better data base.

And we have done that and that data base is now all in a digital format, in a GIS computer data base. And we have the benefit of that data base to make changes with.

Now, the old planning process _- I guess with that I'll turn on my first slide. I only have about five slides. And I think this handout, those of you that have notebooks probably have this handout that you received, but this flow chart is a chart of the planning process which is a little bit different today than it was 10 years ago. Ten years ago or 12 years ago the process, the first step in the process would have been to do _- to issue a notice of intent to write a forest plan, and then to do public scoping and ask the public what they would like to see as far as forest management. And that's a pretty overwhelming thing to ask the public. I think the public felt like a mosquito in a nudist colony, you know, where do I start? Management of a forest that's 7 million acres, people have some specific ideas but if we were to start with that step now and say what do you think needs to be changed as far as forest management we would get some specific comments but we wouldn't get a whole lot of good comments that we could really make use of. But our experience also told us that when we _- so what we would do is we would ask for this public input and then we would go into the sort of forest service homework phase where we take a look at all the natural resources that could be produced on the forest and look at all the laws, and determine what the maximum and minimum level of resources and services that could be produced on the forest. And with that information and the information that we received through public scoping they should put together _- the would come up with the range of alternatives for meeting public issues and staying within the bounds of biological capability and laws and so forth and we'd come out with a draft plan.

Well, at that point the public had very specific comments as to whether they liked it or not because the management direction was displaced on maps and it was spelled out quite clearly and

people could then tell whether they liked it or not. And at that point, you know, the Forest Service had to stop what they were doing and re-do everything because the public now had something that they could comment on and understand and see what the trade-offs were. So this time around we're doing our homework first. And what we've been working on the last year is the analysis of the management situation.

And in that phase we are looking at what we think, what the Forest Service thinks needs to be changed in the forest plan, identifying known problems with forest management and identifying things that have changed over the last 10 years. And you know, we know there was an oil spill in Prince William Sound. We know there's a beetle infestation on the Kenai Peninsula. We know that peoples' values have changed in the last 10 years, even the Forest Service has changed from 10 years ago. The management policy was that of multiple use and today we're going towards the policy of eco system management. And to manage eco systems we have to coordinate more with landowners, both within the boundaries of the forest and outside the boundaries of the forest because eco system boundaries don't stop at the edge of the forest. They extend out beyond the boundary of the forest. So it's a bigger job, but it will result in a better plan, we hope.

So when we complete the analysis of the management situation we will have an idea as to what we think the forest should provide and we will have issue a notice of intent to revise the forest plan and we will identify the range of alternatives. They won't be alternatives, but they'll be the scope with which we could create alternatives from. We won't actually identify alternatives because we want to get input from the public, but we will identify the scope in which alternatives could be created. So we're nearly finished with the analysis of the management situation phase of the planning process. I hope to have a draft AMS done by the end of October that will be reviewed internally on the Chugach National Forest and when I incorporate the comments from that review I will send it down to Juneau and it'll be reviewed by the Regional Forester and his staff. And then I'll have to incorporate the comments into that review. And, theoretically, the AMS will be done around the first of December.

At that point we will begin formal public scoping and this

AMS document is not produced for the public, it's mostly our homework, forest service homework to determine what we think needs to be changed but if the public wanted a copy of it or wanted to look at it they would be welcome to get a copy of it. So at that point we will mail a scoping document that is basically a distillation of the information that we learned in the AMS phase out to the public and say these are the things that have changed in the last 10 years, these are the known problems with the existing forest plan, and these are the things, these are the options that we intend to consider in the revised forest plan as we construct alternatives.

Then the next step will be to develop _- after we've received public input, and I'll probably _- this is one of the first, I guess, opportunities to present a status of the finding effort. And like I say, we haven't really started into the public input phase of this, but after we issue the notice of intent that'll be my job for quite awhile is meeting with people and trying to find out how they feel about the information in the scoping document, in the AMS, and find out what they would like to have changed in the forest plan. That information we'll use to develop alternatives to be considered in the final forest plan. And we'll also begin work on an environmental impact statement to address the impacts of implementing these alternatives.

So that effort will result in a draft forest plan which that will go out for public review and comment and, hopefully, we will be able to respond to those comments that we receive from the public and have a final forest plan on the street by April of 1999. Now, I believe that's an ambitious schedule, but I believe it's possible, and so that's going to be the goal that we're shooting for now. Things could get in the way. Hurricanes, all kinds of things happen on the oil spills, things happen on the forest that could delay us. And that seems to be the rule rather than the exception as planning processes always get delayed, but we're going to shoot for us staying on this schedule and, hopefully, we can.

The next forest slides is just one example of some of the things that we have already identified as opportunities to improve forest management and change what's in the existing forest plan.

One thing that's changes is much of the land that was forest

service land has changed ownership. And a lot of that land has much of the forest timber resources on it, and so the timber management goals that are in the existing forest plan would be difficult to meet now because we don't have as much timber on the forest. This particular map also shows the recommended wilderness area that is in the current forest plan. If you look, this dark shaded green area here is what's recommended as wilderness in the existing plan. There is opportunity to have a lot more wilderness because we have a lot of roadless area on the forest, but there's an opportunity to have less wilderness recommended. There's an opportunity to leave it the same. Nothing has happened with this recommendation in the last 10 years. You know, this will be an issue that will be very controversial and it'll be hard for us to sort out what to do from all the different public comments that we get on this _- on that particular issue.

In the existing forest plan I don't know if any of you have ever looked at it, but in the back of the plan there's a whole bunch of quarter quad maps. They're in black and white. And the way that the management areas and analysis areas that were used to display management direction in the plan were drawn, I believe, is there was a large mylar map on the wall and they drew management areas on this quad map and then they drew in the analysis areas in black and white. And to display them in the forest plan they cut them up into 8 1/2 X 11 sheets. And I don't know how any human could ever make sense out of all those spaghetti lines on those maps in the back of the forest plan.

In fact, it was tough for us to make sense out of it using GIS, but we now have a GIS map of the forest plan management direction, the existing forest management plan direction and just to quickly go through how it works. The forest was stratified into three levels, and the first stratification identified the three major eco systems on the forest which is the Kenai Peninsula, Prince William Sound and the Copper River Delta. And then the area was _- the forest was divided into nine management areas and the Kenai Peninsula was divided into four management areas, and then western Prince William Sound was divided into two management areas, and eastern Prince William Sound was divided into two management areas, and the Copper River Delta was a management area. So that resulted in nine management areas on the forest.

Then the third level of stratification was analysis areas. And there are four different kinds of analysis areas that were identified. And the Chugach plan was probably ahead of its time in this respect in that these analysis areas were based on sort of crude principles of eco system managements. They were based upon vegetation groupings and land forms. And so alpine areas were identified, timber site slopes are the green areas, then there are depositional (ph) valleys and in coastal areas are those shown in orange. And management direction would have been fairly clear if they'd have left the analysis areas to show as the four types, but what they chose to do was to give these analysis areas unique numbers in each of the management areas in which they're found. So what resulted in _- what that resulted in is 22 different analysis areas which it's much easier to understand if you look at it this way, but you can't understand it at all if you look at the maps in the forest plan, but if you have this map, these are the analysis areas that we have today and there are 22 of them.

And the forest plan management direction as displayed by analysis area and one of the criticisms of the existing forest plan is that management direction is broad and general. And some of the goals and objectives are to improve fish and wildlife habitat, maintain landscape character. Other people have identified that as the strength of the plan, that it provides a lot of flexibility for making on the ground resource management decisions. But other people feel like the management direction is too broad and too general to really provide any kind of guidance for the ground management.

So what we intend to do or what we hope to do in the revised forest plan is have management areas _- this is just an example of how it could be done. A management area would be an area that would have a primary resource use emphasis such as wilderness. The existing recommended wilderness is shown here. If you wanted to know what the management direction was for wilderness you'd go to the section in the forest plan that talks about that and it will give specific management direction you could find on the ground. Other things, would be the ANILCA fish and wildlife habitat conservation direction on the Copper River Delta would be a management area.

One of the things that the existing forest plan does not have in it is any mention of wild and scenic rivers. That _- they were not looked at in the original forest plan and we have done an analysis of all the rivers on the forest. We looked at about 760 named rivers and several hundred unnamed rivers and of that we determined that about 25 of those rivers had outstanding or remarkable resource values which would make them eligible to be designated as wild and scenic rivers. So in the revised forest plan in the range of alternatives different rivers would be recommended for different classifications. Wild and scenic rivers could be a management area. If we had marine parks those could be management areas. They would all be managed the same.

In some cases, for example, here is Coghill Lake and River which is eligible for a wild and scenic designation. It's also within the wilderness study area. Management direction for those two areas overlap and so management direction would be additive for those two areas, but they could not be in conflict with each other. It'd be impossible to deal with that, so it would _- it is okay to overlap but they could not be in conflict.

So this is just a demonstration tool to get the point across of how management _- showing management directions could be improved. When we put _- when we go out for public comment if a person had, just for example, an area that had very high subsistence use value or subsistence resource use opportunities and they felt that that area should be managed for that emphasis it theoretically could be a management area or all of them that are on the forest could be a management area and we could write specific standards and guidelines and goals and objectives for those areas that would specify that those resources were emphasized.

So it's going to be a long process. And I'll be doing a lot of public involvement work in it, and I suppose the more I do the better the plan will work out. But I guess that's all I have unless anybody has any questions. It's kind of a complicated process.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any comments or questions?

MR. JOHN: I've got a question. It's kind of overwhelming to me going through this thing, but.....

MR. LEHNHAUSEN; We can turn the lights on if you want.
MR. JOHN: Yeah.

MR. LEHNHAUSEN: I don't have any more slides.

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I want to ask you a question on this map.

MR. JOHN: Like for subsistence value or opportunity, the area for subsistence use, would you _- you know, if you're making up a management plan or whatever you time you've got, but would the Southcentral Council or the councils in Alaska be updated on what's going on for particular subsistence use?

MR. LEHNHAUSEN: They could be involved as much they had the time to be involved. I would certainly be available for _- to receive your input, to discuss your concerns and your issues any time. You know, the need for process has specific windows of opportunity identified to comment on things, but I don't care about that. If somebody has a good idea, any time, you know, unless we've already made a decision to go some other way which that's not going to come until April of 1999, there's always an opportunity to receive good ideas and try to deal with them.

The key is the sooner that we get people's input the easier it is for us to deal with it. After we get a long ways down the road if somebody comes up with a good idea it's a lot harder to deal with it, so the sooner we get input the better it is.

MR. JOHN: Yes. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have a question, a quick one. On designation of river, whether it be wild and scenic or whatever, I don't know what the process is. Is that a mandate by the Act (ph)

MR. LEHNHAUSEN; Yeah. The wild and scenic rivers act requires us to take an inventory of all the rivers that are on the forest and to identify those that have outstanding or remarkable resource values. And the act is somewhat nebulous in that it's not clearly defined what's outstanding or remarkable. And it was

a difficult process for us because if you compare our rivers to the rivers of Arizona every river we've got is outstanding and remarkable. And so the act says that you compare them to rivers within the region that they're found. And so the regions we used are the ecological sections which is a eco system process. It's pretty much been agreed to nationwide a way of identifying eco systems. And so if the river was outstanding or remarkable within the ecological subsection in which it was found, then we said that it was eligible. And so what we've done so far is just identify those rivers with outstanding remarkable values. Now, that'll be something that the public will be able to comment on when we go out for scoping. They can say, well, you didn't identify this river and it has this outstanding and remarkable value. And if they're right we'll say we missed that one and we weren't aware that it had that value, and so we'll say, yeah, that river is eligible also.

And then when we recommend a river we don't have the authority to designate the river as wild, scenic or recreational, only Congress does. It's a lot like wilderness in that respect that we will say, recommend the Nellie Juan River to be designated as a wild river or the Coghill River to be designated as a wild river. And then Congress can do what they want with that recommendation.

But on the other hand, if we were to identify say, a subsistence use area that was so important that it needed to be managed mainly for that resource _- and I'm not trying to tell anybody what to do or what to suggest, but we wouldn't have to go to Congress to do that. Anything that had a special resource value, whether it's wildlife critical habitat or whether it's an archeological district or something, those areas need to be managed to maintain those resource values and then they would be management areas.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One other quick one before somebody else asks you questions. And that's you mentioned that there's lands going out of the Forest Service management? How does that happen.....

MR. LEHNHAUSEN: Well, as a result of ANILCA.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: How does that happen?

MR. LEHNHAUSEN: Well, as a result of ANILCA legislation the State and Native groups were _-.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Chance to select.

MR. LEHNHAUSEN: Yeah. Were allowed to select certain National Forest lands and those have _- some of those have been conveyed, but not all. And so those are some changes that have happened in the last 10 years that we need to see if that will result in us changing some management direction.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other comments or questions? Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: I have a question. I notice that you have a boundary line here, here basically land, upland, headland, headland, and then I look at our other regional Southcentral. I was just wondering are these Forest Service boundaries right here or are those just _- because they don't correspond to the boundaries of the Federal Public Lands open to subsistence use on the Southcentral Kenai.

MR. LEHNHAUSEN: That's kind of been a contentious issue depending on who talk about, but when Congress created the Chugach National Forest that's the lines they drew. That is the boundary of the forest.

MR. LOHSE: These are the lines of the forest then right here. Even if the Federal government claims land outside of that that becomes forest land right there then?

MR. LEHNHAUSEN: Say that again?

MR. LOHSE: Even if on this other map where it shows the federal line being considerable _- well, for example, the federal line would take off and go around here _- well, it looks like a three mile distance on this Southcentral Federal Public Lands. But this is actually the Forest Service boundaries?

MR. LEHNHAUSEN: Yes.

MR. LOGAN: You're asking about the water portion, Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: Yeah. Just, you know, the boundary lines on this map go headland to headland and they don't even go _- actually this line here goes to point instead of off to Cape Hinchinbrook where on the other map it goes quite a ways out. It goes all the way out to Middleton Island and then it crosses over to Gore Point.

MR. LEHNHAUSEN; Rod was saying, I think the other lines you're pointing to are game management unit boundaries. Is that right?

MR. LOGAN: If that's the map up there you're talking about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yeah, the same.

MR. LOGAN : Yeah. You're looking at game management boundaries, those are not forest.

MR. LOHSE: Okay. Those are game management units out there. Okay.

MS. MEEHAN: This one here, the game management. The stuff that's green on this map is Forest Service. Okay.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other questions or comments? I understand we've got to leave here at what time, Helga, by what time?

MS. EAKON: The owners would like us to be done, recess tonight by 9:30 because they need to clean up for tomorrow.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you.

MR. KURNIK: I'd like to make a comment if I could, please, I came a little bit late. This concerns.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Oh, on this subject here.

MR. KURNIK: No.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You're up next.

MR. KURNIK: Oh, excuse me.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. We have John Kurnik that wants to speak on the game management.

MR. KURNIK: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Could you come up here and state your name?

MR. KURNIK: Yeah. My name is John Kurnik (ph). I reside here in Glennallen and I have a homestead on McCarthy Road where I've spent a considerable amount of time. And this year I was doing quite a bit of hunting, I decided to go quite a bit of time and do a lot of hunting. And at the beginning of the season I went up into the Tonsina Drainage right here in the Wrangell Mountains chasing sheep. And I've hunted a lot of those drainages there. And there was nothing up there but wolves. I saw one bull moose the whole season. I was in there for approximately two and a half to three weeks. I saw one bull moose and few really nice rams, but that was it. But the wolves were everywhere. And also this summer on my homestead there was a wolf about five feet from my door, right out the front door. I mean that was only one. I counted three different wolves right on _ - I mean within 20 feet of my homestead, within the cabin there. And I've seen them on McCarthy Road which is rare nowadays because the amount of traffic there is hellatious. There's just _ - there's nothing but a plume of dust and traffic up and down that road, but you go early in the morning on that road, real early 'cause I have a business here in town and I spend the weekends or three or four days or whatever, and I come back to here to town early in the morning, you'll see a wolf out there usually, if not one maybe two. And there's a lot less moose. And I don't know if a lot of people here are aware of what's going on out there, but there are a tremendous amount of wolves breeding and just pacing along. I mean I've seen them on the Tonsina early in the morning, the middle of day and at evening, you can see them at any given time of day out there if you spend some time out there.

And, again, I didn't expect to see it by my homestead, but where I'm usually out, out and about the cabin a little bit, right

there, middle of the day. So that's all I have to really say. I just wanted to make, you know, you people aware of this.....
Yes?

MR. LOHSE: John, I just drove that road three times in the last week with snow on the ground.

MR. KURNIK: Uh-hum.

MR. LOHSE: And I've only seen one wolf track. I've seen lots and lots of coyote tracks, but I've only see one wolf track.

MR. KURNIK: Oh, I know what wolves look like, believe me. I know what wolves look like.

MR. LOHSE: I believe you. But I mean I just.....

MR. KURNIK: There's a lot of coyotes, there's always been a lot of coyotes out there. Most people don't trap them because there's not much of a market anymore, but there's a lot _- in fact, if you don't believe me you can ask the people out there in Silver Lake. I mean they were just saying, hey, did you see all the wolves come through here. They were right out in front of Ed Belmond's (ph) which is Mile 10, from there all the way up to about Mile 14 which is (indiscernible). I mean they're just crossing back and forth. And again, out in Tonsina also. Just sit out there and just wait 'cause they will come through. So.....

MR. LOHSE: I was just wondering because like I said I drove it this morning and I drove it.....

MR. KURNIK; Well, most people don't _- I mean they're on that road, hell bent for leather, you know, if they can do 90 miles an hour they're going to do it on that road.

MR. LOHSE: John, I don't.....

MR. KURNIK: No, that's fine. I take an old beat up truck that's why I see game on the road. But anyway that's all I have to say. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you, John. You know, I share the

same concern about wolves that you do and I've said that many times at this Council meeting, you know, just for your information. There are too many wolves over in Game Unit 11 and probably through here and 13 also. I know there's way too many over in 11 because that's where I've been hunting over the last 12 years and I share the same concern.

MR. KURNIK: I've been hunting out there for 19 years and I've seen _- I was up there sheep hunting one time looking at a ram and I wondered why he got spooked. There were three wolves right across right behind him. That's way, way up on the ridges up on Dixie Pass, but now we've got a lot more people up there so you don't see that much more game. I mean it's more _- they're pushed back further into the other drainages.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you. Any other comments or questions on that? DO we have time for one more agency or.....

MS. EAKON: We'll get done with the reports by 9:30.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Do you want the BLM report?

MS. EAKON: Yeah. BLM next.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay.

MR. COFFEEN: Well, I can help with that because I can be brief. My name is Mike Coffeen. I'm the District Wildlife biologist for the BLM Office out here in Glennallen. this is the seventh year for the Federal Subsistence program here in Glennallen. And in that little short report as I've mentioned this office has now issued about 1,491 permits, caribou permits. And we issued a total of 469 moose permits. The office _- we changed our timing on issuing permits a little bit this year. We did Saturdays last year and we just didn't get too many people coming on Saturday, so we just used extended hours from 8:00 to 6:00 starting July 16th. And the public seemed to appreciate that and the issuing went fairly well. We also issued permits out at Myers (ph) Lake and the Paxson Roadhouse.

The moose season for Unit 13 did not change in the booklet for 1996. It opened on August 1st and closed September 20th. We did issue about 13 percent fewer permits over 1995. And I don't

have any good reasons for that. I don't have as yet anything very preliminary, comments and data on the moose hunt. And I'll be getting that from the Fish & Wildlife Service office as things progress and the data comes in from the cards.

Concerning the caribou, the situation's the same as last year in the subsistence booklet. So, once again, the Glennallen District Office requested Fish & Wildlife Subsistence office maps that state the season for the Federal Subsistence caribou hunt. And so after all the parties were conferred with the Board did approve a special rule as you approved earlier, and so our hunt out here will be matching the state seasons. The hunt has gone fairly well so far. We had a bit of a flurry the last four or five days of September, unfortunately, I missed that but my BLM ranger reported that things did get a little congested on the Richardson Highway and there were some close calls, but the hunt went fairly well.

We did have a situation that happened on October 6th, the Sunday Anchorage Daily News in their outdoor hotline had a subsistence hunt article for out here. And so far this office in Glennallen has gotten about 150 phone calls on that because everybody in Anchorage thinks that they can now come out here and hunt Federal subsistence. What happened was we tracked it down and an editorial writer in my BLM Office in Anchorage condensed a two page carefully worded news release that we put out here in the local newspaper into one paragraph. And they left out a lot. And so we've been getting a lot of phone calls on that. They will be issuing a retraction on that and, hopefully, we'll be able to correct it, but we are not issuing permits to everyone in Anchorage. In fact, when I went to get that screen the phone was still ringing and it was someone asking about that, but we will get that corrected. If anyone's interested I have copies of the newspaper article. That's all I have.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any questions or any comments? I have one, Mike.

MR. COFFEEN: Yes, sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: And that's do you have protection officers here?

MR. COFFEEN: Yes, we have one BLM ranger out here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: One officer.

MR. COFFEEN: That's it. That's Joe Morris.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I have one more, I think. And that's the Federal land north of Sourdough there _- or not north o _- yeah, I guess around that area there are Federal lands, there are, correct?

MR. COFFEEN: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: How wide is that? How wide.....

MR. COFFEEN: It's anywhere from two to four miles wide along the river corridor, and then there's some isolated tracts on the east side. We do issue a larger scale, quarter inch to the mile map to people with their booklets out of the office. And we have on the wall a very large scale map that people are trying to.....

MR. CHAIRMAN: Did you have any problems on which lands are Federal and State way out there in the woods with people getting confused?

MR. COFFEEN: Yes. So we tell people to be careful and to take a map, you know, and try to carefully locate themselves.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I often wondered that myself....

MR. COFFEEN: Yeah.

MR. CHAIRMAN:because I go out there once in awhile.

MR. COFFEEN: Well, we have signs along the highway so at least they can tie in on the map, okay, this is where it starts and it goes in this direction from the sign on the highway. I did put those additional wooden signs up.
Ralph?

MR. LOHSE: I had a chance to observe that last week or last week _- I guess, last weekend, I guess. Those signs on the highway, that just basically means that on both sides of the highway corridor it's Federal land, it doesn't have any indication how far back it comes from the highway.

MR. COFFEEN: Right.

MR. LOHSE: But most of the hunting taking place within the first 200 yards from the highway from what I saw.

MR. COFFEEN: Yeah, that's it.

MR. LOHSE: Or closer. They would basically all be on Federal land then, wouldn't they?

MR. COFFEEN: Yes.

MR. LOHSE: Some of them were a lot closer than 200 yards.

MR. COFFEEN: Yeah. Okay. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you, Mike. Okay. We have time for one more?

MS. EAKON: Yeah. We can finish the two.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Alaska Department of Fish & Game.

MR. SANDERS: My name is Gary Sanders, and I'm out of the Juneau Office, the Headquarters Office. And we don't really have a report. I just wanted to give you kind of an update. About a year ago I was appointed to the State Federal Subsistence liaison team that interacts with our counterparts on the Federal Permit side. And I was appointed about a year ago, like I said, because that was in anticipation of the Federal government getting involved in subsistence fisheries management. And that is my area is the fishery side.

I think most of you are familiar with John Morrison's presence in the past with game. He recently retired. At this time it's undecided whether or not wildlife conversation is going to

put someone else in that role, but that still leaves three of us. There's two from our Division of Subsistence and myself. I actually work in sport fish, but I represent both sport fish and commercial fisheries. And I will be here through the entire meeting and I hope to get an opportunity to talk with each of you during that time.

Any questions?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does anybody have any questions or comments? If not thank you very much. We have Copper River Native Association. No Report? I thought somebody told me earlier they weren't reporting. Gloria Stickwan is back here from Copper River Native Association, but she wasn't going to give their report, Ken John was going to give the report and he's not here tonight I understand. Is that correct?

MS. STICKWAN: He's not going to be here.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Okay. Any other reports and a comment? If not, I guess we're done for this evening. We'll recess till 9:00 a.m. _- or 8:30, do you want to start at 8:30. 8:30 a.m. And, Ralph, if I'm not here can you start the meeting?

(Off record 9:45 p.m.)

(PROCEEDINGS TO BE CONTINUED)

* * * * *

C E R T I F I C A T E

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA)
) ss.
STATE OF ALASKA)

I, Rebecca Nelms, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska and Reporter for R&R Court Reporters, Inc., do hereby certify:

THAT the foregoing pages numbered 02 through 47 contain a full, true and correct Transcript of the Southcentral Alaska Subsistence Regional Advisory Council meeting taken electronically by Annalisa Delozier on the 7th day of October, 1996, beginning at the hour of 7:00 o'clock p.m. in Glennallen, Alaska;

THAT the transcript is a true and correct transcript transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability;

THAT I am not an employee, attorney, or party interested in any way in this action.

DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 16th day of October 1996.

Notary Public in and for Alaska
My Commission Expires: 10/10/98